

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 15, 16, 20, 27, 29 and 33 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. Therefore, claims 1-33 are pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:**

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 15, 16, 20, 27, 29 and 33 have been amended and because the amendments of these claims serve to improve the form of the claims, are clearly supported by the original specification and drawings, and relate to subject matter which should have been well within the search field of the Examiner. As such, any further search by the Examiner is unnecessary.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:**

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ando et al (U.S. Patent 6,373,803), which has an effective priority date of parent U.S. Patent Application No. 09/660,556 filed September 12, 2000, which fully supports the claimed invention. This rejection is overcome.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, briefly, it is noted that claim 1 has been amended to recite a recording medium on which content stream data is recorded, comprising a Stream Object (SOB) formed with first and second Stream Object Units (SOBUs). The first SOBU includes first and second application time stamps (ATs) that indicate reproducing time information of the SOBU, and a first application packet disposed between the first and second ATs in which a portion of the content stream data is packed. The second SOBU includes a second application packet, an end of which represents an end of the SOB, and a stuffing packet

in which the second ATS is copied and in which a payload is recorded.

The reference to Ando does not disclose these features. In particular, the reference, which is related to the segmenting of stream blocks to have a predetermined data size, fails to disclose the specific structure of the second SOBU, which includes a second application packet, an end of which represents an end of the SOB, and a stuffing packet in which the second ATS is copied (from the previous SOBU) and in which a payload is recorded.

Rather, the reference to Ando merely discloses a series of ECC blocks each of which is distinctly identified. That is, stream block #1, which appears to correspond to the first claimed SOBU, includes ECC blocks  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , while stream block #2, which appears to correspond to the second SOBU, includes ECC blocks  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\zeta$ . Therefore, since stream block #2 does not include anything corresponding to a second application packet and only includes distinctive ECC blocks  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\zeta$ , applicants respectively assert that Ando does not show the claimed, "second SOBU including a second application packet, an end of which represents an end of the SOB, and a stuffing packet in which the second ATS is copied and in which a payload is recorded."

It is further noted that these amendments take into account the comments provided in the Office Action, and, in particular, those found on page 2 that suggest that the claim fails to further specify the condition of the last SOBU. Responsively, applicants respectfully assert that the claim amendments now provide details as to the structure of the second (i.e., the last) SOBU.

Thus, applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is patentably distinguished from the reference to Ando and, therefore, respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome.

Regarding the rejection of claims 6, 15, 20, 27, 29 and 33, it is noted that the rejections of these claims are overcome for similar reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1. With respect to claims 6, 20 and 29, it is noted that the rejections of these claims are also believed to be overcome due at least to the recitations of the third SOBU including stuffing packets for correction including an ATS.

Regarding the rejections of claims 2-5, 7-14, 16-19, 21-26, 28 and 30-32, it is noted that these claims depend from claims 1, 6, 15, 20, 27, 29 and 33, and that, therefore, the rejections of these claims are overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

**CONCLUSION:**


There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited. If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Finally, if there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 3/19/07

By:   
Howard I. Levy  
Registration No. 55,378

1400 Eye Street, NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510